World Alliance News Letter

Vol. XXXIII, No. 2 Published by The Church Peace Union February, 1957

HOLBROOK LIBRARY NOT RELIGIOUS

Brotherhood, Yes; Uniformity, No

OBSERVERS of the American scene, from de Tocqueville to Toynbee, have noted our fondness for the moral sentiment. Motherhood and brotherhood, peace and justice, decency and fair play: these words call-up an immediate response in American hearts.

The response is admirable. It testifies to a certain generosity in our national character. But it has its dangers, too. It may distort reality, by making virtue seem easier than it really is — a mere matter of articulation, obvious and uncomplex.

An annual observance such as this month's "Brotherhood Week" is a time to remember these things. Everyone is in favor of "brotherhood." But a too simple view of "brotherhood" — as of anything else — may destroy the very thing it intends to serve.

The notion, for example, that historic differences between groups are necessarily tragic or, at best, unimportant, that the movement towards "brotherhood" is a movement towards religious and cultural uniformity, would destroy the very concept of cooperation in a pluralistic society. Legitimate "brotherhood" requires mutual charity. It must not demand anonymity.

The interfaith movement is a case in point. No responsible religious leader has ever denied that the various religions, working together, can make an indispensable contribution towards establishing justice and world order. Here there exist wide areas of agreement among the major faiths. But to say this is not to say that what divides them in other matters is irrelevant or unimportant, a legacy of narrow "sectarianism." To maintain this is to invite distrust of the very notion of interfaith cooperation, because such cooperation then seems subversive of specific religious commitment.

Issues basic and profound are involved in being a Catholic, a Protestant, or a Jew. No interfaith movement worthy of its vocation should obscure this fact or seek to sentimentalize it away.

WHEN these truths have been stated, one may safely turn to the positive opportunities offered by "Brotherhood Week." What, in the America of 1957, are the issues on which men of divergent religious views can and should be united *as* religious men? There are many, and some are obvious.

The most obvious, of course, is the racial question. Here the challenge to religion and to the adherents of religion is clear beyond possibility of evasion or doubt. A historic revolution is taking place in our world — most immediately in our own land. Century-old patterns of racial injustice are being wiped away. Sins of racial pride, of inequality and segregation, are being called to judgment. In this revolution, religious men must play a major role. If they leave this role to others, if they remain indifferent or slow, they betray religion's most profound belief: the unity of the human race and the brotherhood of all men as children of God. There is, on this principle, no division of religious opinion.

There should be no division either, on the question of more prosperous nations' assisting less fortunate areas of the world. Legislators may argue over the details of foreign economic aid programs, and religious men may argue over them too. But on the principle of such aid there should be no religious dispute. From religion's viewpoint, both justice and charity require that nations possessing a superabundance of the world's goods share it with nations in need.

Statesmen, quite properly, state this in terms of enlightened self-interest: foreign aid is necessary to defend and strengthen the free world. Religious men agree, but their position, as a religious position, transcends any argument from self-interest, legitimate as this argument is.

A religious position on foreign economic aid, like the religious position on race, is rooted in the principle of the brotherhood of all men, of all nations, under the fatherhood of God. This principle has practical consequences in the economic-political order. No nation is an island. No nation can refuse to act when men in another nation suffer. And to the extent that a nation is powerful and rich, to that extent does its obligation towards weaker,

poorer nations in the world increase. These are truths that religious men must constantly impress upon the public conscience.

Both of these questions — racial justice and foreign aid — call for immediate action in our society. And here, as in other areas, religion provides a special insight, a moral imperative for action. Passing beyond considerations of self-interest, religion contemplates a more essential interest: the interest of the human person and his dignity as a child of God.

It is to the service of such essential interests that the interfaith movement should summon us. The movement must not become, therefore, a mere department of American life — the religious equivalent of some fraternal organization in which differences are forgotten and "good fellowship" reigns supreme. Elsewhere in this issue of the *News Letter,* Mr. Will Herberg warns against such a tendency in the interfaith movement now. Where it exists it must be arrested, and redirections must begin.

Religion's historic vocation in society is to question the world's complacencies, to humble its pride, to deflate its pretensions and to ennoble its vision. This is religion's vocation now. The interfaith movement, to the extent that it remains true to the best insights of those who take part in it, will serve the nation by challenging the nation. Should it become secularized and "Americanized," however, a guarantor of the status quo and an agent for cultural uniformity, it would serve no useful purpose at all. As Mr. Herberg observes, the movement must be inter*faith* or nothing.

Tito in Washington?

Rumors — apparently well-founded — continue to suggest a possible visit by Marshall Tito to Washington. Possible, that is, unless the protests now widely heard cause the Administration to withdraw any invitation to the Yugoslav dictator it may have issued.

The protests have considerable substance, and much moral fervor, behind them. And they come, in large part, from religious groups. How, it is asked, can this nation mantain the integrity of its moral life if Communist tyrants are "welcome" to its capital? How can we conscientiously entertain an avowed enemy of religion and of those concepts of individual freedom that form the basis of our democratic life?

Legitimate as such questions are, they seem to miss the point. Diplomatic meetings imply no moral approval, and diplomacy, if it is to be effective, cannot be "purist." The question of whether or not the United States should invite Marshall Tito to Washington is a practical question which, it seems, the Administration must decide in practical terms of the national interest. It is not a question that can be answered in terms of abstract principles. Such principles, too easily applied, might have kept Pope Gregory from going forth to meet Attila before the gates of Rome.

As the Boston *Pilot,* newspaper of the Catholic diocese of Boston, recently asked, in case the Yugoslav Marshall *should* come to Washington: "Is it really likely Tito might infect us? Or is it more likely we might infect him?" This, rather than moral abstractions, is the point at issue here.

RECOMMENDED MAGAZINE ARTICLES

Europe's Crisis and America's Dilemma by Kenneth W. Thompson. (*Christianity and Crisis,* January 7, 1957.)

In an extensive, close and critical analysis of the continuing international crisis, Dr. Thompson argues that "the dread disease from which American foreign policy suffers is that, while we have strong, bold visions of the ends of international life, we falter in the realm of means."

The Decade Ahead: A Symposium on the World of 1957-1967. (*The New Republic,* January 14, 1957.)

Five distinguished political analysts — among them, Joseph C. Harsch and Hans J. Morgenthau — comment on Walter Lippmann's thesis that, in international affairs, "an order of things is dissolving and a new order to follow it is now waiting to be conceived and then brought into being."

The Wrangle over the Doctrine by Max Freedman. (*Manchester Guardian Weekly,* January 17, 1957.)

Mr. Freedman presents a brief but brilliant summary of Congressional debate over the President's controversial proposals. "Neither the Administration nor the Democratic party," he believes, "is willing as yet to face the stubborn enigmas of the Middle East."

Reconstruction of an Alliance by Geoffrey Crowther. (*Foreign Affairs,* January 1957.)

The former editor of *The Economist* offers a realistic basis for strengthening American-Anglo-French cooperation. Britain and France, he writes, must accommodate themselves to the fact that they have become largely dependent on the United States, but the United States must realize that its partners are not *totally* dependent. None of the three countries can dictate to another "what he shall regard as vitally important."

The Eisenhower Doctrine by Harry S. Truman. (Distributed by the "North American Newspaper Alliance." *U. S. News and World Report,* January 25, 1957.)

The former President of the United States lends his support to Mr. Eisenhower's Middle East program and suggests how it might be strengthened within the total context of U. S. foreign policy.

The Coexistence of Believers and Unbelievers by Peter Cardinal Gelier. (*Cross Currents,* Fall 1956.)

The Cardinal-Archbishop of Lyons makes a plea that may be historic for mutual charity and understanding between Churchmen and those who cannot accept any form of revealed faith.

Some Perils of Interfaith Life

"Americanization" Presents Subtle Dangers to Religious Cooperation

Will Herberg

THE interfaith movement, annually celebrated during February's "Brotherhood Week," is one of the most significant features of American life; perhaps the most significant thing about it is that it is so thoroughly and characteristically American. Every effort to transplant the American pattern of tri-faith cooperation much beyond our borders has failed, or has been converted into something very unlike the original intention. Only in this country has it flourished, to the point indeed where one might almost say that it has become a recognized part of our way of life.

The success of this movement, the way it has "taken" in America, is surely not due to any special proclivity to brotherhood or tolerance on the part of the American people; rather does it testify to some deep need in American life which the interfaith idea serves to express and to satisfy.

The rise of the interfaith movement in recent years, it seems to me, is to be traced primarily to the fact that it so well reflects institutionally the emergence of America as a *three-religion country*. A generation or two ago, America could well be described — indeed, Andre Siegfried so described it in 1927 — as a Protestant country, a country in which Protestantism was the "national religion." Normally, to be born an American meant, in those days, to be a Protestant: this was the religious identification that in the American mind quite naturally went along with being an American. Other religions seemed "foreign." In effect, Protestantism was America's "established church."

By and large, this is no longer true. Today, to be born an American is no longer taken to mean that one is necessarily a Protestant: Protestantism is no longer the obvious, the "natural," American religious identification. The United States has become a three-religion country: the normal religious implication of being an American today is that one is either a Protestant, a Catholic, or a Jew. These are accepted, by and large, as three alternative forms of being religious in "the American way."

If today America may be said to possess a "national religion"— that is, a form of religious belonging which is felt to be involved in one's belonging to the national community — it is the tripartite system of Protestant-Catholic-Jew. Something like ninety-five per-cent of the American people today identify themselves religiously in one or another of these three categories, which are familiarly designated as the "three great faiths."

—Mr. Herberg is the author of *Judaism and Modern Man* and of *Catholic, Protestant, Jew.*

The primary purpose of the interfaith movement has always been (to quote the statement of the National Conference of Christians and Jews) "to promote justice, amity, understanding, and cooperation among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews" and to strive to mitigate the "intergroup prejudices which disfigure and distort religious, business, social, and political relations." (The emergence of a three-religion America is not likely to do away with the need for such programs, since the new way of co-existence of the "three great faiths" seems to be engendering new kinds of tensions and conflicts, though in part reducing the old.)

BUT the interfaith movement as we know it today has gone considerably beyond this original and still basic purpose. The interfaith movement today, in effect, articulates the new shape of American life, and therein lies its characteristic appeal to the American mind. To the normal, well-meaning American, it seems eminently right and proper that Protestant, Catholic, and Jew should cooperate to overcome intolerance, strengthen brotherhood, and promote worthy civic causes, for are they not all Americans, at bottom the same kind of people?

Indeed, as the older ethnic identifications tend to fade out with the appearance of a stabilized third generation, there is a growing feeling that unification along interfaith lines is the most appropriate way of expressing the comprehensive unity of the American people.

Thus, even the "I am an American Day," officially designed to demonstrate the American unity of the various ethnic-immigrant groups that make up our population, is now celebrated along *interfaith* lines. "Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, with a Negro chairman, united to celebrate I Am an American Day . . . ," is how one New York newspaper reported the event last September. Once Protestants, Catholics, and Jews are included, it is felt, then *all* Americans are included, and the way to include *all* Americans in any enterprise is to establish it along interfaith lines.

Civic improvement movements, a community survey on housing, a committee to investigate abuses in labor unions, institutes on crime, juvenile delinquency and alcoholism, appeals for Hungarian relief, and of course movements to further better relations among religious and racial groups: these are some of the activities currently organized and operated as interfaith projects. As the three-religion character of the country assumes more definite shape, the interfaith — or rather tri-faith

— pattern tends to become increasingly common as the normative pattern for civic enterprises that make any pretensions to scope and comprehensiveness. In this sense, the interfaith movement must be understood as not simply the expression of high ideals, but as the reflection of something basic in the emerging structure of American life.

Therein lies its ambiguity, and the ambiguity of the whole interfaith movement. The very fact that it reflects something basic in American life — the transformation of America into a three-religion country — enters subtly, even imperceptibly, to mould the shape and meaning of the interfaith idea in a way that should arouse the concern of those to whom this idea means so much.

It is not easy to describe just what is involved here, but perhaps it can best be stated in this way. Since interfaith represents to the American mind the institutional expression of the unity of Americans in their "three great faiths," that unity tends to find its grounding in their common "American-ness," and that of course means in "the American Way of Life." The cooperation of the three religions is seen as the natural cooperation of the three *American* religions, the three "religions of democracy." "After all, we're all Americans" may be taken as the operative philosophy of much of the interfaith movement in this country.

It will not do to disparage this sense of American unity grounded in "the American Way of Life." It is a unity that has been by no means easy to achieve, and is correspondingly precious to a people so diverse in their origins and background as are Americans. The only question is: is this kind of unity appropriate to a movement that describes itself as inter*faith*?

For what does it mean to interpret interfaith brotherhood under the slogan: "After all, we're all Americans"? It means to make *Americanism* the final term of reference, the ultimate context of belonging, that beyond which there is nothing and therefore that in terms of which everything else, including religion, is to be vindicated.

There is a strong tendency in this country today, observers have noted, to convert "the American Way" into a great overarching faith that provides a quasi-sacred bond of unity for the ultifarious diversity of American life. Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism are esteemed because they are felt to be proper, though of course varying expressions of this American faith, and interfaith brotherhood becomes really a tri-faith solidarity of those who share "the American Way." Anyone who thinks that this is an overstatement would do well to recall how frequently the "moral and spiritual values of democracy" are invoked to define the common commitment of Americans and to lay the ground for the interfaith movement; what are the "moral and spiritual values of democracy" but "the American Way of Life" on its religious side?

This conception of the interfaith movement — the tri-faith unity of Americans *as* Americans — seems to me to be dangerous alike to religion and to democracy. For in effect it idolatrizes "the American Way" and converts it into an absolute, which is subversive of true democracy; and it turns Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism into mere "religions of democracy," which is subversive of all true religion. It makes democracy into a religion, and religion into a phase of our national culture — the highest phase, it is true, but merely a phase nevertheless.

Democracy to be democratic must know its place and recognize a higher law and a higher majesty; religion to be authentic must preserve its note of universality and transcendence, and refuse to allow itself to be identified unequivocally with *any* way of life, even the best that men have devised. It is thus that each can be true to itself and yet serve the other.

What may be called the "Americanization" of the interfaith idea — in effect, its thoroughgoing secularization — is responsible, at least in part, for many of its weaknesses and anomalies. The strong religious charity that should animate it tends to degenerate into a sentimentalized form of national fraternity, often called "tolerance." And where in the world is there such a paradoxical combination of close interfaith cooperation with almost total religious isolation as exists in this country, where Protestants, Catholics, and Jews live together as neighbors in the same communities, often in the same houses, closely associated in the same civic enterprises, and yet remain incredibly ignorant of and fundamentally uninterested in, each other's religious life and institutions?

For all that, however, the interfaith idea is a great and powerful idea, and the interfaith movement a great and constructive movement. It serves a very useful, indeed indispensable function in a pluralistic society such as ours organized on a three-religion basis. But to serve this purpose well, it needs to be clear as to its true nature and conscious of the pitfalls that await it on every side. The deepest inspiration of the movement must be more than civic, more than a common allegiance to democracy or "the American Way." It must spring from a strong *religious* sense of the love of neighbor and the dignity of man, and it must be nourished by a vital awareness of the common *religious* heritage of Protestant and Catholic, Christian and Jew.

The real and significant bond between our faiths is not that they are all American, but that they are all Biblical: we all recognize Abraham as our father and the God of Israel as our God. The differences between

the three religions are not trivial; they are very real and often of crucial importance, not to be dissolved into a generalized commitment to "the American Way of Life." Yet they are differences within a common religious framework usually designated as the Judeo-Christian tradition, and it is this common religious framework that, in my conception, gives ultimate meaning to the interfaith enterprise.

The adherents of each religion of course remain free to bear witness to their faith in its uncompromising fulness, yet all have a common religious responsibility, and therefore too a common interest in an interfaith witness where such witness is possible. In pursuing this interest, they will also be cementing closer bonds of brotherhood and promoting the cause of justice and human understanding in American life.

The interfaith idea, embodied in the familiar tri-faith pattern, constitutes a development of genuine promise, but in order to realize that promise, it must remain true to its authentic religious sources and guard against the perils of secularization to which the pressures of American culture expose it.

Religion and International Affairs

Robert C. Hartnett

A four-day Graduate Seminar on Ethics and Foreign Policy, attended by forty editors of religious publications, was held at the New York headquarters of The Church Peace Union last month. At the opening session, the Reverend Robert C. Hartnett, S.J., former editor-in-chief of America *and presently Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Loyola University in Chicago, spoke on "International Responsibility and our Religious Heritage." Excerpts from Father Hartnett's address follow:*

I THINK the truth of an all-embracing divine purpose is the most important contribution we can draw from our religious heritage in the cause of world peace. As religionists, as believers, as trustees of the Judeo-Christian heritage, we have no special competence to devise the complex political and economic and cultural instrumentalities necessary to achieve a better world-order. All these human improvisations belong to the category of *means.*

Our role, first and last, is to insist on *ends,* and to learn from others, and from our own experience, by the slow process of trial and error, which means seem suitable at any given juncture to promote the kind of relations between nations which we know that God, the Father of all mankind, has ordained as moral imperatives for His human family. . . .

The reason this firm allegiance to divine purpose is our paramount contribution to world peace is manifold, because the deepest obstacles to world peace arise from antagonisms between peoples, not about means, but about ends.

For example, the framers of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 and of the subsequent Emergency Refugee Act pursued false ideals. They were not mainly concerned about the moral obligations of this great nation towards the oppressed children of God. Rather, they were thinking in selfish, nationalistic, prideful terms of letting into this part of God's earth only as many immigrants as we could conveniently, comfortably absorb. . . .

Our religious heritage also warns us not to expect too much of human providence. The United Nations is a case in point.

The professed orientation of the UN as set forth in Article I (really the Preamble) of the Charter coincides, I am sure, with God's purposes for mankind. It soon became apparent, however, that the USSR's commitment to these purposes, as we had every reason to suspect, was purely verbal and tactical. . . .

Insofar as the United Nations has failed to live up to our expectations as an instrument of collective security, I think the reasons plainly lie, first, in the religious apostasy of the Communist world, its incapacity to share the vision of mankind's moral and spiritual purposes our religious heritage has taught us, and secondly, in our own excessive optimism about the contrivances of human providence.

In the golden glow of San Francisco back in the Spring of 1945, we were "over-sold" on the UN. We imagined that sinful mankind, drenched in the bloodbath of World War II, would somehow be restored to the state of original innocence by the mere psychological catharsis of that harrowing human tragedy.

We were wrong — but not totally. To my mind, the United Nations, on balance and when viewed in the perspective of mankind's millenia of religious experience, instead of in the close-up of modern man's conceit in his own inventiveness, has emerged over the past decade as a definite, though qualified, success. We are learning — slowly, painfully, but learning, nevertheless.

When you call to mind that our religious heritage never gained ascendancy in the continents of Asia and Africa and that in Europe and the Western Hemisphere it has been overlaid for centuries with the detritus of self-centered, even fanatical, nationalism and utilitarianism and rationalism and infidelity, the very *survival* of the United Nations, after a decade of earth-shaking stresses, is a ground for solid hope.

The time for believers to stand behind this undoubtedly ambitious and yet indispensable instrument of world-wide cooperation for peace is surely not merely in the first flush of enthusiasm, but when people with shorter memories, more shortsighted purposes and illusory dreams of an earthly paradise are tasting the sour juices of worldly disillusionment. "Patience," indeed, "is the badge of all our tribe." The people of God have been schooled through the centuries to work things out humbly through forbearance and faith and hope and love.

Books in Review

A Catholic Examines the Protestant Principle

The Spirit and Forms of Protestantism by Louis Bouyer. The Newman Press. 234 pp. $3.75.

By Robert McAfee Brown

LOUIS BOUYER, a French Roman Catholic priest who was once a Lutheran pastor, has written the most important single book on the vexing problem of "Protestant-Catholic relations." A careful reading of this book will go a long way toward discrediting the kind of distortion and stereotype which often characterizes both sides of the discussion.

This is not to say that Father Bouyer has given us the last word. But he has said a very important *next* word, by giving a new kind of Catholic assessment of the Reformation, one which was anticipated in part in George H. Tavard's *The Catholic Approach to Protestantism,* and Karl Adams' *One and Holy.* And both Catholics and Protestants who read this book will be forced to do some serious rethinking.

For Father Bouyer says many things about the creativity of the Reformation which Catholic readers would never take seriously from the pen of a Protestant, but which they cannot dismiss lightly in a book written by one whose eminence as an interpreter of his own tradition (see his remarkable *Liturgical Piety*) places him beyond the pale of suspicion.

Conversely, Protestants who have been used to Catholic dismissals of the Reformation as an "immense disaster for humanity" (Maritain) or worse, will have to take seriously the fact that a scholar can really understand and appreciate the Reformation and still make his spiritual home in Rome.

All of this means, inevitably, that Protestant readers will find parts of the book immensely appealing (up to about page 136, where a radical shift in the argument occurs) and that they will be disappointed or irritated by the rest of the book, while Catholic readers may be perturbed and even dismayed by the first part of the book, and begin to breathe easily and approvingly only when Father Bouyer finally makes clear why Catholicism is still The Truth in spite of all the good things he has said about Protestantism.

— Dr. Brown is Auburn Associate Professor of Systemmatic Theology and the Philosophy of Religion at Union Theological Seminary in New York.

A BRIEF resumé of the argument of the book should make clear why both groups of readers will have ambivalent reactions. It is the author's contention that what he calls "the positive principles of the Reformation" were in no sense a departure from Biblical faith, but were a much needed recovery in Christendom of the central Christian affirmations.

Father Bouyer documents this in his treatment of the main themes of the Reformers—the free gift of salvation, the sovereignty of God, *soli Deo gratia,* justification by faith, and the sovereign authority of Scripture. Far from being heretical, as conventional Catholic polemics usually assert, he contends that these are the heart and center of Christian faith.

He illustrates his thesis with copious quotations from Luther and Calvin—and he cites the best material from these writers, rather than the familiar catena of quotations, so familiar in polemical literature, which show them at their worst. He sees how fidelity to the gospel underlay all their efforts. He is careful not to fall into the usual misinterpretation of justification by faith as nothing more than rampant individualism, and he shows that the doctrine of *sola gratia* is not a heresy, but is to be found in the entire history of the Church.

Father Bouyer argues that the supposed "pessimism" of the Reformation doctrine of man is "precisely that of Christian tradition." He believes that the "magnificent conception" of the *soli Deo gloria* in Calvin "is not Calvin's creation [but] derives . . . quite definitely from the Bible itself and from the purest Christian tradition" (although he erroneously asserts that "it was through the medium of Luther that Calvin reached these sources").

This Catholic scholar believes that Calvin's system is "the strict application of a profoundly religious insight, whose validity Catholics should find it quite impossible to dispute." He understands, too, how Protestantism stands in relation to Scripture: "Far from being a religion of the book, [Protestantism] is a religion of the Word, the religion of the God who speaks . . . Throughout the history of Protestantism, the Word of God remains, in its essence, the proclamation of a living 'good news', which is always identified with Christ . . ."

To all of this, the Protestant says a grateful Amen.

BEGINNING at page 136, as noted above, Father Bouyer's argument takes a distinct shift. For here he turns to what he calls the "negative" elements of the Reformation. He feels that Protestantism is not able to maintain real fidelity to its own positive principles but, with a kind of "mysterious fatality," draws negative implications from them which destroy them.

The "forms" of Protestantism thus defeat its "spirit," and it is only within the Roman Catholic Church that the positive principles of the Reformation, inherent in Christian faith, can be developed in their full depth. Thus "the Catholic Church [is] necessary to the full flowering of the principles of the Reformation."

What are some of these negative elements? In Father Bouyer's view they are, among others: the confusion of the doctrine of *sola gratia* with a doctrine of "extrinsic justification," a "denial of the objective value of the sacraments", "an absolute denial of the authority of the Church", and "a fictitious opposition set up between the authority of the Word of God in Scripture and that of the Church in its tradition and magisterium."

These Protestant heresies, he maintains, are nominalist in origin; they are the survival "within Protestantism of what was most vitiated and corrupt in the Catholic thought of the close of the Middle Ages." Thus, he thinks, the real tragedy of the Reformation is that it was not radical enough; it failed to emancipate itself from medieval nominalism.

Worse than this, Father Bouyer argues, the positive principles that

were present in early Protestantism soon became subject to decay: historically, Protestantism has led practically to its opposite, for out of Protestant orthodoxy emerged the emasculated Protestant liberalism of recent history. He traces this shift in a highly instructive, and often telling fashion, although he gets badly trapped by his own dialectic when he comes to the conclusion that "If 'orthodox' Protestants regularly beget 'liberal' Protestants, the 'neo-orthodox' whom liberals engender in their turn, only bring forth atheists."

Even the "revivals" within Protestantism are unsatisfactory for Father Bouyer since they perpetuate Protestantism's negative elements; this argument brings him to the conclusion that a recovery of the positive principles of the Reformation will lead a true Reformer back to the Church of Rome.

THERE is not space, in a review of this length, to comment adequately on the latter half of Father Bouyer's book; another book in its turn would be demanded. The present reviewer is not nearly so troubled by the conclusion to which the author comes (which could have been predicted in advance) as he is by the strange route by which the author gets there. Having found a real understanding of Protestantism in the book's first 136 pages, the Protestant reader is not prepared for the way in which Father Bouyer subsequently takes practically everything back.

Thus, the Protestant reader finds, the Calvinist doctrine of the sacraments is "riddled by Zwinglianism" in such a way as to deny the doctrine of the real presence. The God of Calvin is the "God of Sinai." Protestant sacraments are only a "juggling with signs of divine objects." In the place of divine authority in the Church, "Protestantism sets up purely human ones." Churches of the Reformed tradition "*always* end by delivering over their members to the subjective views of each minister" (italics added). And so on.

Any Protestant would want to challenge the adequacy and the accuracy of each of these and countless other statements. And, one must note, when Father Bouyer discusses Barth, Barth is unrecognizable. The notion that Barth has a theology which "is designed precisely to avoid any real contact of God and man," simply cannot be taken seriously by anyone who has understood the *Kirchliche Dogmatik*.

These examples surely indicate that no one can ever completely understand a living faith from which he stands apart. But there are *degrees* of understanding, and Father Bouyer has penetrated further into an understanding of the Reformation than most contemporary Catholic thinkers.

For this, both Catholic and Protestant readers stand immensely in his debt. They should regard his book as a highly significant next step in the ongoing ecumenical discussion—a discussion which will be enriched by the extent to which Louis Bouyer's contribution is taken seriously.

SUGGESTED READING

The Big Thaw by C. L. Sulzberger. Harper and Bros. 275 pp. $4.00.

Mr. Sulzberger, foreign affairs analyst for the New York *Times*, combines journalism and scholarship in evaluating the profound changes that have shaken the Soviet empire since Stalin's death. His observations on Soviet-Yugoslav relations seem particularly valuable.

Prospero and Caliban: A Study of the Psychology of Colonization by O. Mannoni. Frederick A. Praeger. 218 pp. $4.25.

The historic move towards self-government among formerly dependent peoples and the fall of Western prestige in the East have been the occasion for a major psychological crisis in the world, Professor Mannoni believes. He argues that one of the major difficulties confronting world stability is the failure of each world really to understand the motivations and aspirations of the other.

Religion and Social Work edited by F. Ernest Johnson. Harper and Bros. 194 pp. $3.00.

More and more, government tends to take over the social welfare responsibilities that once belonged to the Churches. The Jewish, Protestant and Catholic contributors to this volume, which is a publication in Harper's "Religion and Civilization" series, examine the social work of the Church and synagogue within the context of this evolution.

The Mentor Book of Religious Verse edited by Horace Gregory and Marya Zaturenska. The New American Library. 238 pp. 50 cents.

Anthologies of religious verse often tend toward either the sentimental or the banal. Mr. Gregory and his wife, Marya Zaturenska — both distinguished poets in their own right — present an original, critical, and highly catholic collection of religious poetry, most of it never assembled together before.

Day is Dawning: the Story of Bishop Otto Dibelius. The Christian Education Press. 222 pp. $3.50.

Otto Dibelius, Evangelical Bishop of Berlin, has become in our time a symbol of the Church's strength, courage and integrity before the threat of Communist power. This biography makes clear why the symbol is valid.

Transnational Law by Philip C. Jessup. Yale University Press. 113 pp. $3.00.

The former United States ambassador-at-large, now Professor of International Law and Diplomacy at Columbia University, advances the need for a specific code of international law to govern the increasing complexities and growth of international trade and travel.

The Notebooks of Simone Weil. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 2 vol. $10.00.

Simone Weil has become for many a kind of tortured, existentialist saint for our age. These notebooks, which movingly record her anguish over the modern world and its alienation from the Divine, bolster a reputation for universal significance which seems sure to grow.

Arms and Men by Walter Millis. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 382 pp. $5.75.

One of America's leading military analysts makes a valuable survey of current armament problems. His treatment of the thermonuclear question is of particular interest.

Days to Remember: America 1945-1955 by John Gunther and Bernard Quint. Harper and Bros. 240 pp. $5.95.

In more than 400 photographs and 45,000 words of text, a turbulent decade is recaptured.

COMMUNITY IN THE WORLD

Brotherhood Week Observances

A number of religious organizations have planned activities this month in celebration of Brotherhood Week, February 17-24. Sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Brotherhood Week will be marked by rallies, luncheons, conferences, and by radio, television and press observances. In addition, the Synagogue Council of America has proclaimed February 16th as Brotherhood Sabbath. More than 2,200 rabbis, ministering to 4,000 Jewish congregations throughout the country, will participate.

Race Relations Sunday

The thirty-second annual observance of Race Relations Sunday will be held February 10th. Sponsored by the Department of Racial and Cultural Relations of the National Council of Churches, Race Relations Sunday is intended as the vehicle by which churches may emphasize the need to build a continuous program of education and action for the improvement of race relations. In addition to its annual Race Relations Sunday message, used widely by newspapers, radio, television and church publications, the National Council makes available program suggestions for adult groups, young people's groups, and children; a general worship service and an information leaflet which gives current facts about Negro Americans, American Indians, Japanese Americans, Chinese Americans and Spanish speaking people. The age group programs offer resources such as books, visual aids and action projects which are useful in building a program that continues throughout the year. Sources for the observance of this Sunday may be obtained from local councils of churches or from the Department, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

Geneva Meeting

The Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches will meet in Geneva, Switzerland February 4-8. Relations with the Russian Orthodox Churches and the possibility of visits by Council members to Churches within the People's Republic of China will be subjects of discussion.

At the United Nations

- With the admission of Japan in December, 1956, the United Nations approaches universal membership. The only parts of the world now unrepresented in the UN are: Switzerland, which has not asked for admission because of the fear that UN membership would prejudice traditional Swiss neutrality; Outer Mongolia, whose application was vetoed by Nationalist China in 1955 and in 1956 failed to get the necessary seven votes in the Security Council; three countries in which rival governments claim jurisdiction over the whole (Germany, Korea and Vietnam); mainland China; colonies, several of which are now on the point of achieving independence. The Gold Coast (to be renamed Ghana) will become independent in March and will probably be the next country to be admitted to United Nations membership.
- Celebrating its tenth anniversary, UNESCO counts among its many achievements the publication of more than one thousand surveys, handbooks, studies, monographs, reviews, dictionaries, manuals, bibliographies and periodicals covering all the UNESCO fields. UNESCO publications have so far appeared in twenty-eight languages; the greatest number have been printed in English, French, Spanish and Arabic, in that order.

World Alliance News Letter

Vol. XXXIII, No. 2 February, 1957

The World Alliance News Letter *is published monthly by The Church Peace Union. Subscriptions are $1.00 per year.*

The Church Peace Union: Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, President; *Rev. George B. Ford,* Vice President; *Dr. Arthur J. Brown,* Treasurer; *Dr. A. William Loos,* Executive Director; *John R. Inman,* Associate Executive Director.

Articles in the News Letter *express the views of the authors, and do not necessarily represent the official position of The Church Peace Union.*

Office Address: 170 E. 64th Street, New York 21, N. Y.

Editorial Board
WILLIAM CLANCY, Editor
A. WILLIAM LOOS JOHN R. INMAN WILLIAM J. COOK
MERVYN W. ADAMS, Editorial Assistant

World Alliance News Letter
The Church Peace Union
170 East 64th Street
New York 21, N. Y.

Non-Profit Org.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
New York, N. Y.
Permit No. 7246

To the Librarian
Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, California

Form 3547 requested

129